

below are based on an interpretation of the prior art relied on by the Examiner, in view of the subject matter set forth in the claims of the Applicants' patent application.

Various amendments have been made to claims 1-11 to clarify the claimed subject matter. These amendments are supported in the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

As amended, claim 1 recites, in part:

"in response to an input from a user, selecting one of a plurality of directories, each of said directories comprising one or more entries and being related to a respective type of communication, each of said entries corresponding to at least one of said data elements of one of said records...." (emphasis added)

Also, claim 3 as amended recites, in part:

"in response to an input from a user, selecting one of a plurality of directories, each of said directories comprising one or more entries and being related to a respective type of communication, each of said one or more entries corresponding to a respective one of said records...." (emphasis added)

It is respectfully asserted that neither Abdul-Halim nor Hashimoto are seen to teach or suggest at least the above-highlighted features of claims 1 and 3. By example, in contrast to these features, Abdul-Halim is seen to teach merely that a portable device 10 operates in response to receiving a paging message that includes a telephone number by searching a name directory 100 to determine if the telephone number in the received message matches with a telephone number in any personal name directory entries 102 of the name directory 100. If there is a match, a canned message corresponding to the personal name directory entry that matches the received telephone number is displayed (see, e.g., the Abstract). Nowhere in the Abdul-Halim patent is there seen to be any express disclosure or suggestion of selecting one of a plurality of directories

in response to a user input, wherein each of the plurality of directories comprises one or more entries and is related to a respective type of communication, as set forth in claims 1 and 3.

Also in contrast to claims 1 and 3, Hashimoto teaches merely that by operating an input section, a person may register plural calling numbers (including an area code) in a memory section of a paging device. Thereafter, upon the paging device receiving a calling number, a registered calling number corresponding to the received calling number is searched in last-to-first sequential character order from a calling number directory within a memory section of the paging device, and the calling number (including the area code) is displayed on a display section of the paging device. In this manner, even if the received calling number does not include an area code, the calling number including the area code can be displayed to a user (see, e.g., the Abstract and col. 3, lines 16-29). Nowhere in the Hashimoto patent is there seen to be any express disclosure or suggestion of selecting one of a plurality of directories in response to a user input, wherein each of the directories comprises one or more entries and is related to a respective type of communication, as set forth in claims 1 and 3.

Being that neither Abdul-Halim nor Hashimoto are seen to disclose or suggest at least the above-highlighted features of claims 1 and 3, a combination of these references would also not disclose or suggest these features. As such, claims 1 and 3 are deemed to be patentable over these references, whether considered individually or in combination.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 3. Claims 2, 4, and 5 are also deemed to be patentable over the prior art relied on by the Examiner, at

least for the reason that each claim depends from a patentable base claim.

The rejection of claim 6 will now be addressed. As amended, claim 6 calls for a personal digital assistant (PDA) which comprises:

"a storage means having a data base for storing one or more records, each of the records comprising data elements defining an identifier of a party and communication information required for communicating with the party through an electronic communication link;

a first user input means, said first user input means being operable by a user for inputting a search key corresponding to at least one of the data elements of at least one of said records;

a search engine for comparing at least one of the data elements of at least one of the records to the search key;

a display for displaying at least a portion of those ones of said records having at least one data element corresponding to the search key;

a second user input means, said second user input means being operable by the user for selecting one of the records having at least one data element corresponding to the search key; and

electronic communication means for initiating an electronic communication to the party identified by the identifier defined by data elements of the selected record, using one of a plurality of types of electronic communication." (emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that neither Abdul-Halim nor Hashimoto are seen to teach or suggest at least the above-highlighted features of claim 6 relating to a personal digital assistant that comprises a second user input means which is operable by a user for selecting a record corresponding to a user-entered search key, and an electronic communication means for initiating an electronic communication to a party identified by an identifier defined by data elements of the selected record. In

contrast to these features of claim 6, the devices taught by Abdul-Halim and Hashimoto appear to be employed only for receiving paging messages from a paging system transmitter, and for presenting appropriate messages to a user through a display in response to receiving these messages. It is not seen that the respective devices taught by Abdul-Halim and Hashimoto have a capability for enabling a user to select a record corresponding to a user-entered search key, and for initiating an electronic communication to a party identified by an identifier defined by data elements of the selected record.

Being that neither Abdul-Halim nor Hashimoto are seen to disclose or suggest at least the above-highlighted features of claim 6, a combination of these references would also not disclose or suggest these features. As such, claim 6 is deemed to be patentable over these references, whether considered individually or in combination.

Claims 7-11 are also deemed to be patentable over the prior art relied on by the Examiner, at least for the reason that each claim depends from patentable base claim 6.

Dependent claims 12-24 have been newly added. Support for these claims appears throughout the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

Claims 12-18 depend from base claim 1, claims 19-22 depend from base claim 3, and claims 23 and 24 depend from base claim 6. Each of these claims is deemed to be patentable over the prior art relied on by the Examiner, at least for the reason that each claim depends from a patentable base claim.

New independent claim 25 and corresponding dependent claims 26-28 have also been newly added. Support for these claims appears throughout the specification as originally filed.

No new matter has been added.

Independent claim 25 is an apparatus claim that includes similar subject matter as that of corresponding method claim 1, and is deemed to be patentable over the prior art relied on by the Examiner for similar reasons as those argued above. Claims 26-28 are also deemed to be patentable over the prior art relied on by the Examiner, at least for the reason that each claim depends from a patentable base claim.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims as now presented are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's Attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank DeLucia

Frank A. DeLucia

Reg. No.: 42,476

8/21/98

Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT. 06430

Telephone: (203) 259-1800
Facsimile: (203) 255-5170